United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

			·						
Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge		1 141411111	C. Ashman	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge					
CASE NUMBER		97 C	6328	DATE	1/16/	2002			
CASE TITLE			Robin Hollis vs. Joel M. Nuby, et al.						
ΜO	TION:	[In the following box (a of the motion being pre		e motion, e.g., plaintiff, defer	ndant, 3rd party plaintiff, and	(b) state briefly the nature			
DOCKET ENTRY:									
(1)	☐ File	d motion of [use listin	g in "Motion" box ab	ove.]		·····			
(2)	☐ Brie	Brief in support of motion due							
(3)	□ Ans	Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due							
(4)	□ Ruli	Ruling/Hearing on set for at							
(5)	☐ Statı	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at							
(6)	□ Pret	Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at							
(7)	□ Tria	Trial[set for/re-set for] on at							
(8)	☐ [Ber	[Bench/Jury trial] [Hearing] held/continued to at							
(9)		This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] ☐ FRCP4(m) ☐ General Rule 21 ☐ FRCP41(a)(1) ☐ FRCP41(a)(2).							
[Other docket entry] Enter memorandum opinion and order. Plaintiff's motion to vacate order of voluntary dismissal to reinstate case, and for leave to file second amended complaint and summons on third party defendants is denied.									
(11)		further detail see orde	r attached to the orig	inal minute order.]	<u></u>	Texa no decides de Cices de estas			
	,	o notices required, advised in open court.			2	Document Number			
	No notices required. Notices mailed by judge's staff.			-	number of notices				
Notified counsel by telephone.				JAN 1 6 2002	,				
Docketing to mail notices.					m				
Mail AO 450 form. Copy to judge/magistrate judge.				-	docketing deputy initials	70			
Copy to Judgermagistrate Judge.			Fil	ED-ED3	1/16/2002				
IS		courtroom deputy's initials	02.140	16 PM 3: 07	date mailed notice				
			Date/time	received in erk's Office	mailing deputy initials				
				THICT COURT					

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

DOCKETED

JAN 1 6 2002

ROBIN HOLLIS,)		
	Plaintiff,)	Case No. 97 C 6328	
v.)	Magistrate Judge Martin C. Ashman	
v. JOEL M. NUBY, a.k.a./d.b.a. J. NUBY HOME IMPROVEMENT COMPANY, JAMES WIDEN, GARY JONES, and			1701011 0.71011101	
JAMES WIDEN, GA	RY JONES, and)		
NEIGHBORHOOD I INC.,	HOUSING SERVICES)		
	Defendants)		

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Robin Hollis seeks relief from this Court's December 8, 2000 order granting Hollis's Motion for Voluntary Dismissal without prejudice. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41. Hollis asks this Court to grant relief pursuant to clause two or clause six of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b).

Relief under Rule 60(b) is an extraordinary remedy that is granted only in exceptional circumstances. *Provident Sav. Bank v. Popovich*, 71 F.3d 696, 698 (7th Cir. 1995). One such circumstance is where the moving party presents "newly discovered evidence which by due diligence could not have been discovered in time to move for a new trial under Rule 59(b)." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(2). Another such circumstance is where the moving party presents "any . . . reason [besides the other five enumerated reasons contained in Rule 60(b)] justifying relief from the operation of the judgment." Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6). A motion pursuant to Rule 60(b) must

be made within a reasonable time, and a motion pursuant to Rule 60(b)(2) must be made not more than one year after the order was entered. Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b).

First and foremost, we deny Hollis's motion under Rule 60(b)(2) because her motion was filed more than one year after this Court's December 8 order was entered. Hollis filed the instant motion on January 7, 2002. But even if that were not the case, we would deny Hollis's motion under Rule 60(b)(2) on substantive grounds. She has failed to present this Court with any facts to show that her "newly discovered evidence" is actually new. She has also failed to present this Court with any facts to show that she could not have discovered her "newly discovered evidence" with due diligence prior to the entry of this Court's December 8 order. Hollis only provides this Court with the most general statements to support her motion such as "Plaintiff . . . identified new evidentiary matters, and additional, relevant facts." (Pl.'s Mot. Vacate ¶ 3.) General statements of this sort are wholly deficient to support a motion for extraordinary relief under Rule 60(b)(2).

The same problems plague Hollis's motion under Rule 60(b)(6). Because Hollis has failed to present any facts to show that her motion was filed within a reasonable time, we deny Hollis's motion under Rule 60(b)(6) as untimely. Alternatively, we deny Hollis's motion under Rule 60(b)(6) because she has failed to present any facts to show that extraordinary relief under Rule 60(b)(6) is warranted. In this regard, we cannot even discern the basis of Hollis's motion under Rule 60(b)(6).

* * *

For the reasons stated, this Court denies Hollis's Motion to Vacate. We note that neither this order nor this Court's December 8 order precludes Hollis from filing a new lawsuit.

Dated: January 16, 2002.

ENTER ORDER:

MARTIN C. ASHMAN

United States Magistrate Judge

Copies have been mailed to:

ERNEST N. POWELL, JR., Esq. 8110 South Cottage Grove Avenue Chicago, IL 60619

ROBERT A. EGAN, Esq. Robert A. Egan, P.C. 221 North LaSalle Street Suite 2910 Chicago, IL 60601

Attorney for Plaintiff

Attorney for Defendants